DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 162 266 CS 004 464

AUTHOR Hao, Ramona
TITLE Basal Reader Study: 1974-75. Technical Report No. 42.
INSTITUTION Kamehameha Schools, Honolulu, Hawaii. Kamehameha Early Education Project.
PUB DATE Mar 76
NOTE 21p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Basic Reading; Educational Objectives; Grade 1; Grade 2; Primary Education; *Program Evaluation; *Reading Achievement; *Reading Instruction; *Reading Research; *Student Evaluation

ABSTRACT

Fifty-two first- and second-grade students participated in a basal reader study in 1974-1975, as a follow-up to a 1973-1974 study. All but four of the subjects had entered the Ginn 360 reading program the previous year as kindergarten and first-grade students; of the 52 subjects, 38 were making satisfactory progress in reading and were considered the regular group, and 14 had shown reading skill acquisition problems and were considered the special group. The Ginn 360 program was used as the basis of the study; assessment devices included criterion-referenced tests, individual records, monitoring of students' attending behavior, and standardized tests. Techniques of positive reinforcement were used by teachers. Analysis of the results indicated that among the students in the regular group, the first graders passed 40.72% of Ginn reading objectives and second graders passed 35.68%, that first graders retained a mean of 85.62% of the objectives passed and second graders retained a mean of 88.91%, and that the first graders placed at the 42nd percentile on a standardized reading test while second graders placed at the 14th percentile. The special group demonstrated low achievement. (Tables are presented to show assessment results, comparisons with results from the 1973-1974 study, and comparisons with scores from classes in four other schools.) (GW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED162266

Technical Report #42

Basal Reader Study: 1974-75

Ramona Hao

March, 1976

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

The Kamehameha Early Education Program

a research and development program established and funded by

The Kamehameha Schools/Bernice P. Bishop Estate

Ronald Gallimore, Roland G. Tharp & Gisela E. Speidel,
General Editors

Ellen Antill
Production Editor

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

The Kamehameha Schools

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

The cooperation of the State of Hawaii Department of Education is gratefully acknowledged, as is the support and resources made available by the Sociobehavioral Research Group, MRRC, University of California, Los Angeles.

The opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the position, policy or have the endorsement of The Kamehameha Schools/Bernice P. Bishop Estate, or of the editors.

Published by The Kamehameha Early Education Project, 1850 Makuakane Street, Honolulu, HI 96817

All rights reserved. No parts of this report may be reproduced in any form or by any means without the prior written permission of The Kamehameha Schools/Bernice P. Bishop Estate.

C SO04464

The Kamehameha Early Education Program

The Kamehameha Early Education Program (KEEP) is a research and development program of The Kamehameha Schools/Bernice P. Bishop Estate. The mission of KEEP is the development, demonstration, and dissemination of methods for improving the education of Hawaiian and Part-Hawaiian children. These activities are conducted at the Ka Na'i Pono Research and Demonstration School, and in public classrooms in cooperation with the State Department of Education. KEEP projects and activities involve many aspects of the educational process, including teacher training, curriculum development, and child motivation, language, and cognition. More detailed descriptions of KEEP's history and operations are presented in Technical Reports #1-4.

Technical Report #42

Basal Reader Study: 1974-75

Ramona Hao

This report presents the procedure and results of the follow-up study of the 1973-74 KEEP reading research described in Technical Reports #23 and 26.

The 1973-74 Basal Reader Study pursued two lines of research: motivation and acquisition of reading skills. Since motivation was considered a major problem for island children in learning to read (see Technical Reports #1, 6, and 24), various reinforcement practices were used to increase the motivation of KEEP students while curriculum and instructional methods were held constant.

Concurrently, careful records for each student on the length of time required for the acquisition of each reading objective were kept in order to pinpoint specific reading problems.

However, good motivation in itself, did not bring KEEP students to grade level reading achievement (see Technical Reports #26 and 36).

The 1973-74 data on skill acquisition led to further research, particularly on ways to teach phoneme-grapheme correspondences (see, e.g., Technical Reports #23, 26, 47, 48, and 49). These data along with teacher observations also led to changes in the classroom which are described in the present report.

Method

Subjects

Twenty-eight first grade and 24 second grade students attending the demonstration school of the Kamehameha Early Education Program (KEEP)

participated in the study. Seventy-five percent of these children were part-Hawaiian and 75% were from families receiving state welfare assistance. (For a more complete description of the students and their randomized selection, see Technical Report #13).

The first grade was composed of 13 girls and 15 boys. The second grade consisted of 15 girls and nine boys for a total of 28 girls and 24 boys in this study. All but four of the 52 subjects were also a part of the first year (1973-74) of this basal reader study (see Technical Report #26).

Materials

Ginn 360 Basal Reading Program. The Ginn 360 program was the basis of this particular program. This series was chosen mainly because it is used in many public schools in the state, and because it is an integrated program which includes phonics, word patterns, sight word method, and contextual clues.

Objectives were taken from the Ginn 360 program and listed separately. They were then taught in the order suggested by the Ginn Company.

Supplementary materials were used to provide further practice in the Ginn objectives.

Daily records of the objectives taught to each student were kept.

Assessment devices

Criterion referenced tests.

1. Pretests for each level were given. These pretests were used to decide which objectives needed to be taught to which students.
2. Tests were given each Monday on the objectives which had been taught to the students during the previous week. 100% accuracy on these posttests was required to pass the objective.
3. Retention tests were given two weeks after a student had finished a level and had progressed into a new level of work.

Individual records. The date of each session a student was taught a particular concept was recorded in each student's record folder. These data were used to determine whether some objectives took longer for most students to learn. Need for further research was determined from these data.

Motivation. On-task, off-task, and disruptive data were collected daily during reading classes to monitor the students' attending behavior (see Technical Reports #6 and 19). Training of teachers to establish a high on-task percentage is described in the section Teachers.

Standardized tests:

1. The Gates-MacGinitie Reading Test Primary A, Form 1 was administered to the first grade at the end of the school year, May, 1975. Primary B, Form 1, was given to the second grade. This test was also given at the end of the school year to first and second grade students in four other schools.
2. The California Test of Mental Maturity (CTMM) Level 0 was given to the first grade in May, 1975. Level 1 was given to the second grade at the same time. This test was also given to the same first and second grade students in the other schools who had received the Gates.

Teachers

The reading teachers were trained in the use of positive reinforcement. Teachers attended seminars on behavioral principles, and were encouraged to use explicit praise.

Videotape practice sessions were conducted in the classrooms, and each teacher was able to see consecutive taped sessions of her own teaching to analyze and discuss with other staff who acted as consultants.

More information on teacher training may be found in Technical Reports #7, 8, 41, and 58.

A total of six reading teachers instructed the first and second grade classes at various times in the school years. This teaching turnover was caused by changes in assignments and the maternity leave of one teacher.

Four of the six teachers were permanent KEEP staff and received the training in motivational and management procedures described above. The other two reading teachers were substitutes for periods of three months or less and given only partial training in these procedures.

Teaching strategies were controlled by following closely the Ginn 360 reading program and by teaching the same list of objectives.

Procedure

In the first year, 1973-74, of the basal reader study, the first grade entered the Ginn 360 program in September. One teacher supervised center activities for language arts and another taught reading. The students were given a pretest on Ginn objectives and placed in groups according to the results. Objectives were taught each week and tests were given on the following Monday to determine whether the students knew the objectives. After the Monday tests, the students were regrouped according to objectives needed.

The second semester, the kindergarten students entered the basal reading program. They were given the pretest and placed with the first grade students in six groups according to placement on this test. All but one of the six groups contained both kindergarten and first grade children. At this point, another reading teacher was added. One teacher continued to supervise center activities for both kindergarten and first grade. The two reading teachers each had three reading groups for two 20-minute sessions during the morning.

The mobility between the groups lessened during the year as groups grew farther apart in achievement. It became more difficult to move children to a more advanced group even though they might be the best in their present group

because of the number of objectives in the interim of the placement of the groups.

During the second year of the study, there were three major changes from the previous year.

First, the classroom set-up was organized into three self-contained groups, each with one teacher for all language arts activities, including reading, for the entire morning. The students in these self-contained groups were selected on the basis of achievement in the basal reading program. Two of the three classes (the two regular groups) were achieving normally. The third group (the special group) was not achieving at a satisfactory level. All three classes were conducted in one large classroom with low tables or shelves dividing the room into three separate areas.

Second, the mobility of the classes was lessened. Only four students were moved from one teacher to another. However, within any teacher's class, movement of students from subgroup to subgroup did occur but not as regularly as in the early 1973-74 program.

Third, since a student's independent activities were planned, prepared, and supervised by his reading teacher, a greater relationship existed between independent center activities and the actual reading objectives that a student was studying.

During the second year of the basal reader program, the curriculum remained identical to that of the 1973-74 program.

Description of the two regular groups

The two regular groups consisted of 16 first and 22 second grade students. There were 22 girls and 16 boys for a total of 38 pupils. These groups were composed of students who had shown proficiency in learning beginning sounds and had continued to progress in the basal reading program during the past year. They entered the program in September at the point at which they had finished in June of the

previous year. Each of the groups were composed of a mixture of first and second grade students.

Table 1 shows the mean CTMM total IQ for first grade and second grade students composing the regular groups. The mean score for the two regular groups combined was 102.50.

Table 1

Mean Total CTMM IQ for the First and Second Grade Regular Group, Special Group, and Total Group

GRADE	GROUP		
	Regular	Special	Total Grade
1st	106.56 (n=16)	74.42 (n=12)	92.79 (n=28)
2nd	99.55 (n=22)	75.00 (n=2)	97.50 (n=24)
Total $\bar{x}$	102.50 (n=38)	74.50 (n=14)	94.96 (n=52)

The two regular groups were treated essentially the same in reading during the 1974-75 school year. Each of them was divided by the teacher into three reading subgroups according to placement on the basal reading objectives. Each subgroup had reading for 30-40 minutes each day. The rest of the morning period was spent doing follow-up activities: writing, spelling, independent reading, and reading games.

The basal reader curriculum for these two classes included decoding skills, sight words, and some comprehension skills, although there was no formal testing of the latter. Supplemental materials were teacher-made worksheets which gave students more practice in certain skills, SRA Kit 1a, Holt-Rinehart Instant Readers, Level 1, Ginn Magic Circle books, HEP Instructional Library,

and teacher-made games and books.

Motivational procedures used were basically the same as in the first year of the study.

Daily stars were given for good answers, perfect test scores, and listening behavior. These were totalled at the end of the week, and the student or students in each reading group with the highest number of stars received a formal invitation to the Friday afternoon reading party: This activity included videotapes of popular programs, stories, or reading with a teacher while eating cookies.

Description of the special group

Two second grade and 12 first grade students constituted the special group. The group was composed of five girls and nine boys who had begun the same reading program as the students in the regular groups during the 1973-74 year. However, these students had been unable to progress past the first level of basal reading objectives (i.e., letter recognition, phoneme-grapheme correspondences, and letter discrimination). In addition to reading skill acquisition problems, these students exhibited few independent skills.

Table 1 shows the spring, 1975 CTMM mean scores for this special group. The IQ range was from 49 to 97 with a mean score of 74.50, about 28 IQ points below the mean of the regular groups. If attending public school, several of these children would have been placed in special education classes.

Consequently, they were placed together in a self-contained language arts class with one teacher for the entire morning. In addition to formal reading, the teacher worked with the students on writing, following directions, visual discrimination, and language training.

This class also used the same basal reader materials as the other two groups, but with different objectives and procedures. For example, a sight

word method was used to teach vocabulary. The children used the basal reader vocabulary to make up sentences about themselves and their experiences to help them on the words.

Some language experience techniques were used to aid both listening and reading vocabulary. Until a student began to generalize for himself, he was not trained in decoding. Later in the year, two students were moved to another class and into the regular basal reader program which included decoding skill.

Results

Motivation

Research assistants took on-task, off-task, and disruptive data on the students during language arts classes for the whole year. On-task was defined as attending to the task or performing the behavior required in a given situation. On-task included appropriate play, getting materials, and the like. Off-task was defined as not attending to the task at hand, that is, behaving inappropriately without bothering others, for example, day dreaming. Disruptive was defined as disturbing other students or the teacher, for example, fighting, shouting, or crying.

For the whole of the 1974-75 school year, the on-task mean for the KEEP language arts classes was 80.00 (SD=4.40), the off-task mean was 16.00(SD=3.46), and the disruptive mean was 4.00(SD=1.59). These data were taken from a daily sampling of all language arts activities, including formal reading sessions with the teachers and independent work.

Reading objectives

Daily records were kept in the reading objectives (ROs) studied and learned by each student. Table 2 shows the mean number of objectives passed by the 1974-75 first grade students and the 1974-75 second grade students who composed

the two regular groups in the first and second year of instruction.

Table 2

Mean Number of Reading Objectives
Passed in 1973-1974 and 1974-1975

Class	Grade Level K	1st	2nd	Mean # of Total RO's Passed to 6/75
1974-75 first grade (n=16)	50.13	199.94		246.94
1974-75 second grade (n=22)		110.77	147.73	258.50

The first grade began their formal basal reader program at the beginning of the second semester of their kindergarten year. The second grade did not have any formal reading program in kindergarten but entered the basal reader in September of their first grade year (1973).

As of June, 1975, the first grade had passed a mean total of 246.94 ROs, and the second grade passed a mean total of 258.50 ROs. The difference between the number of objectives passed by the first grade and the number of objectives passed by the second grade is not significant. Therefore, despite the year's difference in grade level, both classes had achieved approximately the same number of ROs.

Inspection of Table 4 shows that correlations between the total number of ROs passed as of June, 1975, and the Gates-MacGinitie reading subtests and composite score (see Table 4), are very high, especially for the second grade.

The percentage of ROs passed by the first grade was 40.72%. The second grade achieved a percentage of 35.68%. The first grade retained

Table 3

Correlations of Gates tests & Measures of Reading Achievement

	Pretest Percentage		Retention Percentage		Total # Objectives Passed	
Gates Vocabulary subtest	1st.	.8877	1st.	.6815	1st.	.8112
	2d.	.8950	2d	.7417	2d	.8484
Gates Compre. Subtest	1st.	.8895	1st.	.6077	1st.	.7450
	2d.	.6589	2d.	.6721	2d.	.8243
Gates Composite subtest	1st.	.8976	1st.	.6475	1st.	.7856
	2d.	.8206	2d.	.7685	2d.	.9157
Retention Percentage	1st.	.6922	1st.	-----	1st.	.7725
	2d.	.8175	2d.	-----	2d.	.7909
Pretest Percentage	1st.	-----	1st.	-----	1st.	.8365
	2d.	-----	2d.	-----	2d.	.7654

Table 4

Mean Standard Scores of the Gates-MacGinitie Test May, 1975

Grade	Group	Gates-MacGinitie Subtests		
		Vocabulary	Comprehension	Composite
1st (n=28)	Regular (n=16)	49.38	46.81	47.81
	Special (n=12)	31.50	25.83	28.66
	Combined (n=28)	41.71	37.82	39.61
2nd (n=24)	Regular (n=22)	42.90	37.13	39.36
	Special (n=2)	0.00	15.00	7.50
	Combined (n=24)	39.33	35.29	36.70
1st & 2nd Combined (n=52)	Regular (n=38)	45.63	41.21	42.92
	Special (n=14)	27.00	24.28	25.64

85.62% of the objectives passed for at least two to three weeks after they had begun a new reading level. The second grade had a retention average of 88.91%.

The correlations of the pretest and retention percentages with the Gates are shown in Table 3.

Gates-MacGinitie Reading Test

The Gates-MacGinitie Reading Test was administered in May, 1975 to all the first and second grade students at KEEP and to classes at three other schools in Hawaii. The results of these tests are presented by groups in Tables 4, 5, and 6.

Regular Groups

The first grade regular group scored higher on all three subtests than did the second grade regular group. The first grade composite score of 47.81 places them at the 42nd percentile, while the second grade composite score of 39.36 places them at the 14th percentile.

The total mean composite score for all 38 regular group students was 42.92 with a percentile rank of 24. The breakdown of these scores for the vocabulary and comprehension subtests is shown in Table 4. The vocabulary section was consistently higher than the comprehension section.

Special Group

The first grade students in the special group also scored higher than the second grade students on all three subtests of the Gates-MacGinitie Reading Test. However, this may be due in part to the unequal n (2d gr:2, 1st gr:12).

The mean composite standard score for the entire special group was 25.64 which has a percentile equivalent of less than one. For the special group, again the score for the vocabulary section of the test was higher than that for the comprehension section.

Combination groups

The combined group consisted of all students of that grade level, regardless of reading group.

The combined first grade group achieved a slightly higher score on all three Gates subtests than did the combined second grade group.

Comparison between the 1973-74 KEEP first grade and the 1974-75 KEEP first grade

Table 5 compares the KEEP first grade class of 1973-74 and of 1974-75. Only total class scores are shown for the entire 1973-74 first grade because they were treated similarly (i.e., there had been no regular and special groups).

The chronological grade level for these students was 1.8.

Table 5

Comparison of Gates-MacGinitie Scores for the KEEP 1973-74 and 1974-75 First Grades

Grade	Group	Gates-MacGinitie Subtests							
		Vocabulary			Comprehension			Composite	
		$\bar{X}$ S.S.	%	Gr.Sc.	$\bar{X}$ S.S.	%	Gr.Sc.	$\bar{X}$ S.S.	%
1973-74 1st.Gr.	Total (n=28)	34.50	6	1.3-1.4	37.25	10	1.4	35.54	7-8
	Total (n=28)	41.71	18-21	1.6	37.82	10-12	1.4-1.5	39.61	14-16
1974-75 1st.Gr.	Regular (n=16)	49.38	46	2.0	46.81	38	1.7	47.81	42
	Special (n=12)	31.50	4	---	25.83	---	---	28.66	1-2

The 1974-75 first grade class (total) scored higher on all subtests, particularly on vocabulary. The difference between the two groups on this subtest just missed significance (t=1.89, df=54, $p > .05$).

When the 1974-75 first grade students who were in the regular groups were compared with the total 1973-74 first grade, they did significantly better on all parts of the Gates-McGinitie (vocabulary: t=3.61, df=42; $p < .001$; comprehension: t=2.74, df=42, $p < .01$; composite: t=4.00, df=42, $p < .0001$).

It should be noted again that the 1974-75 first grade had passed 246.94 ROs at the end of their first grade year. The 1973-74 first grade (the 1974-75 second grade) had passed only 110.77 ROs at the close of their first grade year (see Table 2).

Comparisons with Schools 1, 2, 3, and 4

Four other schools received the Gates and the CTMM at the same times as they were given at KEEP, spring, 1975. School 1 is located in a middle class suburb of Honolulu. Schools 2 and 4 are both located in an urban area of Honolulu from which KEEP students come. School 3 is located in a rural area of a neighbor island.

With the exception of School 1, there were no significant differences in intelligence, as measured by the CTMM, between KEEP's first and second grade and the first and second grades of the other tested schools. (For a more detailed presentation of the results of the comparison testing, see Technical Report #36).

Table 6 gives the Gates-MacGinitie reading scores for the first and second grades of KEEP and the four schools tested.

KEEP's 1974-75 first grade is consistently better on all subtests of the Gates than Schools 2, 3, and 4. The KEEP second grade has poorer scores on the Gates than Schools 1, 2, and 3, but higher scores than School 4.

Table 6

Gates Mean Standard Score, Percentile, & Grade Score: KEEP & Comparisons

Group & Year	Grade Level	Vocabulary			Comprehension			Composite	
		S.S.	%	Grade Score	S.S.	%	Grade Score	S.S.	%
1973-74									
KEEP	1	34.50	6	1.3-1.4	37.25	10	1.4	35.54	7-8
School 1	1	51.71	58	2.3	50.60	53	2.0	51.14	54
School 3	1	40.08	16	1.4	40.50	16	1.5	40.29	16
School 4	1	33.50	4.5	1.3	37.91	12	1.5	35.70	7-8
1974-75									
KEEP	2	38.08	13	1.6	35.29	7.5	1.6	36.71	8-10
School 1	2	53.82	62	3.5-3.6	51.18	54	3.1-3.4	52.50	58-62
School 2	2	42.74	22.5	2.2	38.22	13	1.8	40.48	16-18
School 3	2	43.55	25.5	2.3-2.4	39.67	15	1.9-2.1	41.33	18-21
School 4	2	33.86	4.5	1.4	37.81	11	1.7	35.83	7-8
KEEP	1	41.71	19.5	1.6	37.82	11.5	1.4-1.5	39.61	14-16
School 1	1	52.58	60	2.3-2.4	53.81	64	2.1-2.2	53.18	62-66
School 2	1	39.38	15	1.5	35.94	7.5	1.4	37.97	10-12
School 3	1	40.53	17	1.5-1.6	33.67	4.5	1.3	35.77	10-12

School 1's first grade is significantly better, as expected, than KEEP's first grade on all three subtests of the Gates (vocabulary: $t=3.06$, $df=52$, $p < .001$; comprehension: $t=3.90$, $df=52$, $p < .001$; composite: $t=3.73$, $df=52$, $p < .001$). School 1's second grade is also significantly better than KEEP's second grade on all three Gates subtests (vocabulary: $t=4.57$, $df=44$, $p < .001$; comprehension: $t=3.96$, $df=44$, $p < .001$; composite: $t=4.72$, $df=44$, $p < .001$).

Discussion

The high correlation between the Gates-MacGinitie Reading Test and the total number of objectives passed seems to show that the Gates adequately reflects KEEP reading achievement. Thus, if the students were moved more rapidly through the ROs, their scores on the Gates should improve and the mean for the class should be closer to grade level.

The high positive correlation between the pretest scores and the total number of objectives passed appears to support the theory that the better a child is at generalizing what he knows to new objectives, the better he will do in reading.

Although the students did not progress rapidly through the objectives, they retained what they had learned very well. The first retained a mean of 85.62% of the objectives passed and the second grade achieved a mean retention of 88.91% of their reading objectives.

Only the regular groups were in the basal reading program during the 1974-75 school year. Of these regular groups, the first grade students did significantly better than the second grade students. They scored almost at grade level. Placing the students in a reading program in midkindergarten as opposed to beginning first grade may have been an important factor.

The low achievement of the special group probably was due to the fact that many would have been in special education classes in a public school.

References

Antill, E. Standardized test results: KEEP and comparisons, 1972-73 (Tech.Rep. #36). Honolulu: The Kamehameha Schools, Kamehameha Early Education Program, 1975.

Au, K. H., & Speidel, G. E. KEEP reading research and instruction: Results of the 1973-74 program (Tech. Rep. #26). Honolulu, The Kamehameha Schools, Kamehameha Early Education Program, 1975.

Brandt, M. E., Au, K. H., & Speidel, G. E. The effect of contingent reinforcement on the acquisition of sight vocabulary (Tech. Rep. #49). Honolulu: The Kamehameha Schools, Kamehameha Early Education Program, 1976.

Gallimore, R., & Tharp, R. G. KEEP reading research: Overall strategy and preliminary results (Tech. Rep. #23). Honolulu: The Kamehameha Schools, Kamehameha Early Education Program, 1974.

Gallimore, R., & Tharp, R. G. KEEP motivational research: Strategy and results (Tech. Rep. #24). Honolulu: The Kamehameha Schools, Kamehameha Early Education Program, 1974.

Lam, D., Kidoguchi, L., Gallimore, R., Tharp, R. G., & Speidel, G. E. The uses and limits of increasing student motivation (Tech. Rep. #16). Honolulu: The Kamehameha Schools, Kamehameha Early Education Program, 1975.

Mays, V., Boggs, S., Tharp, R. G., & Gallimore, R. Selection of children for the KEEP demonstration school: Criteria, procedures, and results (1972-73 and 1973-74). Honolulu: The Kamehameha Schools, Kamehameha Early Education Program, 1975.

Miley, A. Procedures for classroom observations: 1973-74 (Tech. Rep. #19). Honolulu: The Kamehameha Schools, Kamehameha Early Education Program, 1975.

Sloat, K. C. M., Tharp, R. G., & Gallimore, R. The incremental effectiveness of classroom-based teacher training techniques (Tech. Rep. #41). Honolulu: The Kamehameha Schools, Kamehameha Early Education Program, 1976.

Speidel, G. E. Directionality in the acquisition of consonant sounds (Tech. Rep. #48). Honolulu: The Kamehameha Schools, Kamehameha Early Education Program, 1976.

Speidel, G. E. The effect of group versus individual training on the acquisition of consonant sounds (Tech. Rep. #47). Honolulu: The Kamehameha Schools, Kamehameha Early Education Program, 1976.

Speidel, G. E., Gallimore, R., & Tharp, R. G. Explorations in teacher training (Tech. Rep. #7). Honolulu: The Kamehameha Schools, Kamehameha Early Education Program, 1975.

Sueoka, S., Speidel, G. E., & Chun, S. Training in self-examination from the teacher's point of view (Tech. Rep. #8). Honolulu: The Kamehameha Schools, Kamehameha Early Education Program, 1975.

Tanaka-Matsumi, J. KEEP consultation research strategies: 1972-75 (Tech. Rep. #58). Honolulu, The Kamehameha Schools, Kamehameha Early Education Program, 1976.

Tharp, R. G., & Gallimore, R. The mutual problems of Hawaiian-American students and the public schools (Tech. Rep. #1). Honolulu, The Kamehameha Schools, Kamehameha Early Education Program, 1975.